

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
EASTERN DIVISION**

THERESA BARNES, et al.,)
Plaintiffs,)
v.) No. 4:23-cv-01529-JSD
SUSAN PENSONEAU)
d/b/a SBP HOLDINGS LLC,)
Defendant.)

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter is before the Court on plaintiff's motion to appoint counsel. The motion will be denied at this time. In civil cases, pro se litigants do not have a constitutional or statutory right to appointed counsel. *Ward v. Smith*, 721 F.3d 940, 942 (8th Cir. 2013). See also *Stevens v. Redwing*, 146 F.3d 538, 546 (8th Cir. 1998) (stating that “[a] pro se litigant has no statutory or constitutional right to have counsel appointed in a civil case”). Rather, a district court may appoint counsel in a civil case if the court is “convinced that an indigent plaintiff has stated a non-frivolous claim...and where the nature of the litigation is such that plaintiff as well as the court will benefit from the assistance of counsel.” *Patterson v. Kelley*, 902 F.3d 845, 850 (8th Cir. 2018). When determining whether to appoint counsel for an indigent litigant, a court considers relevant factors such as the complexity of the case, the ability of the pro se litigant to investigate the facts, the existence of conflicting testimony, and the ability of the pro se litigant to present his or her claim. *Phillips v. Jasper Cty. Jail*, 437 F.3d 791, 794 (8th Cir. 2006).

After reviewing these factors, the Court finds that the appointment of counsel is not warranted at this time. Plaintiff has demonstrated that she can adequately present her claims to the Court. Additionally, neither the factual nor the legal issues in this case appear to be complex. The

Court will entertain future motions for appointment of counsel as the case progresses.

Accordingly,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel is
DENIED without prejudice. [ECF No. 3]

Dated this 8th day of December, 2023.



JOSEPH S. DUEKER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE